DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 047 661 JC 710 048

TITLE	A Preliminary Report of the Community College Study Committee: A Special Committee of the House of Representatives, 75th Legislature, State of Michigan.
INSTITUTION	Michigan State Legislature, Lansing.
PUB DATE	Dec 70
NOTE	18p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Committees, *Governance, Governing Boards, *Junior Colleges, *Legislation, Power Structure, *Regional Planning
IDENTIFIERS	Michigan

ABSTRACT

This premilinary report consists of two parts. Part I reviews the events leading up to the creation of the special committee to study community colleges in the state of Michigan and presents a chrcnological summary of the committee's activities to December 1970. Part II sets forth the ccmmittee's 18 recommendations for legislative action so as to facilitate thoughtful consideration of the proposals and early introduction of the legislation in the 1971 regular session. [Because of marginal reproducibility of original, this document is not available in hard copy.] (Author/CA)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED047661

A PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDY COMMITTEE

a Special Committee of the

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES -- 75th Legislature, State of Michigan

December 9, 1970

TO: The Speaker of the Michigan House of Representatives

Sir:

Herewith transmitted is a preliminary report of the special committee of the House of Representatives created by House Resolution No. 249 of 1969 and continued and extended by House Resolutions 326 and 601 of 1970. This preliminary report consists of two parts. Part I reviews the events leading up to the creation of the special committee and presents a chronological summary of the committee's activities to date. Part II sets forth the committee's recommendations for legislative action in a timely fashion in order to facilitate thoughtful consideration of the proposals and early introduction of the legislation in the 1971 Regular Session.

* * * * *

JC 710 048

PART I.

On October 9, 1969, the Michigan House of Representatives created, and the Speaker appointed, a special committee to study community colleges. Now, after 14 months of diligent effort, the committee reports that it has completed a comprehensive review of the community college situation within the State of Michigan. The committee also reports that it has studied selected community colleges of particular merit in other states in search of possible solutions for problems common to Michigan community colleges. Moreover, the committee is especially pleased to report that both of these ventures have met with unqualified success.

The genesis of this inquiry dates back to the first year of the legislative renaissance in Michigan, when former Representative and Appropriations Committee member Charles O. Conrad initially raised the prospect of recognizing and encouraging the development of community colleges in Michigan by providing a state appropriation for each community college student in excess of the gross allowance figure for elementary and secondary pupils. The legislature found merit in his proposal, and approved a differential of $25 per student over and above the adjusted school aid gross allowance figure for the 1965-66 fiscal year. Thus impregnated, a separate formula for state

assistance to community colleges flourished within the fertile environment of the state's pro-education fiscal structure.

Each year, as the state community college support program developed toward maturity, community college enrollments expanded and the formula for state appropriations to community colleges became more complex. Some of this growth in size and complexity was normal, logical and healthy--such as the addition of a substantial differential for students in high-cost vocational-technical programs--but, unfortunately, some of the changes which occurred were more mutation than constructive growth. The ensuing stampede of competing community colleges struggling to capture favored positions at the appropriations trough dramatized the need for a comprehensive review of community college planning and financing procedures in Michigan. Realization of this need ultimately resulted in the creation of this special legislative committee.

During the last half of 1968, the higher education sub-committee of the House Appropriations Committee, under the able leadership of sub-committee chairman Representative Thomas G. Ford, Sr., had undertaken an extensive on-campus inspection of the state's sprawling *system* of community colleges. After many weeks and several thousand miles, the sub-committee had concluded that community colleges in the State of Michigan--as excellent as they were--were not adequately fulfilling the existing need of Michigan citizens for community college services. It was evident to the sub-committee that many community colleges were severly limited in their ability to meet the requirements of achieving even the most modest program objectives. Moreover, the wide gap between community college services available and community college services needed and *desired*, in many areas of the state, clearly indicated a substantial need for total reorganization of the state's uncoordinated collection of community colleges. Obviously, such an undertaking threatened to exceed not only the normal scope of operations of the higher education appropriations sub-committee--as it extended far beyond modification of the community college support formula, community college appropriation procedures, or format of the annual higher education appropriation bill--but also it clearly exceeded the scope of previous legislative endeavors of the House standing committee on Colleges and Universities, which had already devoted considerable attention to piecemeal refinement of the basic statutes governing community colleges in Michigan.

While the Governor's Educational Reform Commission pondered the multitude of problems perplexing the state's overall educational system throughout most of 1969, leaders of the higher educational appropriations sub-committee and the standing committee on Colleges and Universities in the House laid the groundwork for a comprehensive joint study of community college planning, basic organization and financing, and held everything in readiness, fully prepared to proceed in the event that the Governor's Educational Reform Commission failed to provide adequate remedies for the manifest ills of the community college segement of the total educational enterprise in the State of Michigan. When the commission's report, issued September 30, 1969, neglected to even mention community colleges, plans for a legislative study of this vital portion of the total educational system were implemented without further delay. House Resolution No. 249 was introduced on October 6, reported out of the House Policy Committee on October 7, approved by the House on October 9, and the committee was appointed by the Speaker that same day.

With the benefit of extensive pre-planning, the study committee was so designed as to combine substantial participation by members of the two standing committees of the House with greatest concern in the area of community colleges--Appropriations and Colleges and Universities. The enabling resolution also provided for the hiring of not only committee staff to carry-out research and clerical functions, but also consultants to bring particular expertise to the study committee's deliberations. In addition to careful consideration of the committee's composition, staffing and financing, the extensive pre-planning also imparted considerable direction and valuable momentum to the initial activities of the study committee. Several guidelines for the committee's task were evident in the *charge* to the committee contained in the enabling resolution. For example, the resolution raised the following overall policy concerns:

(a) The growth of community colleges in Michigan had been generally haphazard and lacking in overall planning;

(b) although the operating budgets of community colleges depend upon a combination of student tuition, state appropriations and local property taxes--one-half of the total tax base of the state was not contributing in any way to the support of community college services; and,

(c) even with twenty-nine community colleges in operation, the population of vast areas of the state still were not being served by any community college.

Moreover, the resolution suggested:

(d) Total educational reform must, of necessity, include solution of the colossal confusion which had heretofore permeated the development of community colleges in the State of Michigan; and,

(e) the best interests of the people of the State of Michigan could be served only by the conception and legislative enactment of an overall plan for future community college development--whereby a sensible state-wide system of community colleges could be created to provide adequate community college services throughout the state.

The community college study committee--consisting of four members of the Appropriations Committee, four members of the Committee on Colleges and Universities, and Representative Conrad's successor who, like his predecessor, had exhibited particular interest in community colleges--launched its formal investigative effort with a three-day seminar at East Lansing on November 6, 7, and 8, 1969. The Superintendent of Public Instruction and the staff of the State Department of Education, and the Executive Secretary, officers and members of the Michigan Association of Community College Presidents and Trustees were very cooperative and helpful in getting the legislative study committee off to a good start on its comprehensive review of community colleges in Michigan. Dr. Robert Lahti, President of nationally renown William Rainey Harper Community College,

Palatine, Illinois, keynoted the seminar. Dr. Sigurd Rislov, Chairman, Department of Higher Education, College of Education Graduate Division, Wayne State University; Dr. James L. Miller, Jr., Professor of Higher Education and Director of the Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan; Mr. Michael Deeb, member of the State Board of Education; and several members of the Executive Office's Bureau of the Budget staff also made valuable contributions to the committee's knowledge and grasp of the community college situation in Michigan.

After the seminar, the nine member study committee divided itself into three 3 member task forces with two majority members and one minority member on each task force. Task Force I held hearings concerning the organizational structure and financing of community colleges at Schoolcraft Community College (November 17); Kellogg Community College (November 19); and St. Clair Community College (December 15). Task Force II held hearings concerning the planning and utilization of facilities at Henry Ford Community College (November 17) and Jackson Community College (November 19). Task Force III held hearings concerning long range planning and instructional innovations at Oakland Community College (November 17). Task Forces II and III conducted a joint hearing at Kalamazoo Valley Community College (December 15).

The entire membership of the study committee met with community college business officers at Ann Arbor (November 18); with the Michigan Association of Community College Presidents and Trustees at East Lansing (November 20); with the State Board of Education and the Community College Advisory Board at Detroit (November 25); and with representatives of the American Association of University Professors, Michigan Federation of Teachers and the Michigan Education Association at the State Capitol (December 11).

The committee visited William Rainey Harper College in Palatine, Illinois (December 8) to observe first hand the operation and physical plant of a community college of considerable national reputation. A majority of the committee also journeyed to California to meet personally with Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, author of "Islands of Innovation Expanding: Changes in the Community College", at UCLA (December 31); and to visit both formally and informally selected examples of California's nationally recognized state-wide system of community colleges. We made an informal inspection of the health-education instructional facilities at Pasadena City College (January 1). Formal visitations were made at Golden West and El Camino Community colleges (January 5); Los Angeles City College and Los Angeles Trade-Tech (January 6); Foothill Community College and the College of San Mateo (January 8); and Laney Community College and the City College of San Francisco (January 9). The committee met with the Chancellor of the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges, his staff, and selected legislative leaders of the California Assembly and Senate in Sacramento on January 7. While most of the committee was busy visiting community colleges in California, the remaining members of the committee visited selected community colleges in Illinois, Florida and New York.

Naturally, the committee held numerous organizational and discussion meetings to assimilate the information gathered through the public hearings and visitations, and to review the voluminous printed material gathered from community colleges in Michigan and elsewhere by the committee's research staff. A conference of the committee members and staff was held

in Southfield (November 16) prior to the initiation of task force hearings; other meetings were held in the State Capitol on December 5, March 12, March 18, May 7 (at the Jack Tar) and May 26. While committee members took time out for campaigning in the August primary and November general elections, the committee staff continued to process the voluminous transcripts of committee hearings and visitations and to prepare a proposed draft of the committee's comprehensive report and recommendations. On November 20, 1970, the committee reconvened in East Lansing and approved the recommendations which are presented in Part II of this preliminary report.

The committee presents this summary of its activities and its recommendations in order to facilitate timely and thoughtful consideration of the proposals during the interim between this year's *sine die adjournment* and the convening of the next Regular Session on January 13, 1971. The full and final report of the special committee on community colleges will be prepared and placed on the members' desks on that date.

* * * * *

PART II.

The committee has agreed to recommend and does recommend as follows:

First, that the Michigan legislature adopt an omnibus community college reform bill embracing the proposals outlined in Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 14, 16 and 17.

Second, that the reform program be timed to go into effect July 1, 1974, and that existing statutes authorizing community colleges as presently constituted be repealed as of that date.

Third, that the legislature adopt such other auxiliary pieces of legislation as are necessary to implement Recommendations 9, 11, and 14.

Fourth, that appropriate concurrent resolutions directed to the State Board of Education; the Community College Board of Trustees and the Intermediate School District Boundary Commission, when established, urging appropriate action on Recommendations 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 17 be adopted by the legislature.

Fifth, that an interim plan for extending community college services to all Michigan citizens irrespective of place of residence, as outlined in Recommendation No. 18, be adopted by the legislature at the earliest possible date.

Representative George F. Montgomery, Chairman

Representative Vincent J. Petitpren, Vice Chairman

Rep. Gerritt C. Hasper

Rep. Thomas G. Ford, Sr.

Rep. Jack Faxon

Rep. Clifford A. Smart

Rep. Dale Kildee

Rep. Hal Ziegler

Rep. Jackie Vaughn, III

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION NO. 1

ESTABLISHMENT OF A STATE-WIDE SYSTEM OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES THROUGH TOTAL DISTRICTING OF THE STATE INTO COMMUNITY COLLEGE REGIONS

The Committee recommends the creation of a state-wide system of community colleges designed to provide a broad selection of educational programs and opportunities throughout the state. Community colleges are properly an integral part of the total educational system, and should be more accessible to students than four-year institutions. Moreover, the availability of community college services in a community usually results in an increase in the proportion of that population seeking post-high school education, not only at the community college but also through other institutions of higher education.

Community colleges should provide a sufficiently broad general academic program to fulfill the instructional needs of freshman and sophomore level students, and thus enable them to transfer *without penalty* to four-year institutions for completion of degree requirements. When fully developed, the community college system should fulfill the instructional needs of approximately three-quarters of all general academic freshman and sophomore students enrolled in the state supported system of colleges, universities, and community colleges. The remainder of such students should continue to receive freshman and sophomore instruction at baccalaureate institutions; but the shift of a significant proportion of lower division students to community colleges will free existing facilities at colleges and universities for expanded upper division and graduate enrollments.

Community colleges should also provide a broadly-based program of occupational and vocational-technical education and training for those individuals who seek a terminal program of two years or less to develop occupational skills and enhance their earning capacities. This second mission of community colleges is even more important than that of providing lower division general academic instruction, because community colleges must provide an even greater proportion of occupational and vocational-technical instruction and training.

Community college costs should be considerably lower for both taxpayers and students than those required by more complex institutions of higher education. The availability of community college services for all Michigan residents at a relatively reduced cost will enrich the lives of every citizen of our state.

The Committee further recommends, therefore, that the entire State of Michigan be subdivided into an appropriate number of community college

regions, not only to provide community college services to every citizen, but also to provide a fair distribution of financial responsibility for the support of such community college services by every parcel of taxable property within the state. This total districting of the state into community college regions should be done in accordance with the following criteria:

a. Each community college region should be financially viable and, therefore, each region should embrace a tax base of not less than $500 million, State Equalized Valuation.

b. To make possible reasonable operational efficiency, each community college region should contain a minimum population of not less than 100 thousand persons, so that an enrollment of not less than 1,000 full-time equated students might reasonably be anticipated.

c. In order that community college services can be provided throughout the state without delay, at least one existing community college facility should be included within each of the new community college regions. Moreover, the boundaries of existing community college districts, intermediate and local school districts, should not be needlessly breached in establishing the boundaries of new community college regions.

d. Insofar as is practical, community college regions should be coterminous with existing State Regional Planning Districts, and due consideration should also be given to such factors as community of interest, transportation accessibility, and patterns of economic activity in establishing the boundaries of community college regions.

The Committee further recommends, therefore, that fifteen (15) community college regions be created substantially as follows:

Region 1. The entire upper peninsula, including the counties of Alger, Baraga, Chippewa, Delta, Dickinson, Gogebic, Houghton, Iron, Keweenaw, Luce, Mackinac, Marquette, Menominee, Ontonagon and Schoolcraft.

Region 2. The counties of Antrim, Benzie, Charlevoix, Cheboygan, Emmet, Grand Traverse, Kalkaska, Leelanau, Missaukee, Otsego and Wexford.

Region 3. The counties of Alcona, Alpena, Crawford, Iosco, Montmorency, Ogemaw, Oscoda, Presque Isle and Roscommon.

Region 4. The counties of Lake, Manistee, Mason, Muskegon, Newaygo and Oceana.

Region 5. The counties of Clare, Gladwin, Gratiot, Isabella, Mecosta, Montcalm and Osceola.

Region 6. The counties of Arenac, Bay, Midland, Saginaw and Tuscola.

Region 7. The counties of Huron, Macomb, St. Clair and Sanilac.

Region 8. The counties of Allegan, Kent and Ottawa.

Region 9. The counties of Clinton, Eaton, Ingham, Ionia and Shiawassee.

Region 10. The counties of Genesee and Lapeer.

Region 11. The counties of Barry, Berrien, Branch, Calhoun, Cass, Kalamazoo, St. Joseph and Van Buren.

Region 12. The counties of Hillsdale, Jackson and Lenawee.

Region 13. The counties of Livingston and Washtenaw.

Region 14. The county of Oakland.

Region 15. The counties of Monroe and Wayne.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL BOARDS OF TRUSTEES FOR LOCAL GOVERNANCE OF THE STATE-WIDE SYSTEM OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The Committee recommends that each of the newly-created community college regions in the state-wide system of community colleges be governed by a non-partisan elected board of trustees. The boards of trustees should have an odd number of members, not less than nine nor more than fifteen, as provided by law, for each region. It is recommended that the enabling legislation designate one of the following alternatives for each regional board of trustees as seems most appropriate:

a. Nine member board elected from single member constituencies for four-year terms.

b. Eleven member board elected from single member constituencies for four-year terms.

c. Thirteen member board elected from single member constituencies for four-year terms.

d. Fifteen member board elected from single member constituencies for four-year terms.

e. Nine member board elected three members from each of three constituencies for staggered six-year terms.

f. Fifteen member board elected three members from each of five constituencies for staggered six-year terms.

All trustee constituencies within a region, whether single or multi-member, should contain as nearly as possible equal numbers of persons under the 1970 and each subsequent decennial federal census.

The Committee further recommends that nominations for the board of trustees in each region should take place in August, 1973, and the first election of new trustees should be conducted in November, 1973, with initial terms of office to commence January 1, 1974.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

CREATION OF A STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEE APPORTIONMENT COMMISSION AND REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEE APPORTIONMENT COMMISSIONS

The Committee recommends that a State Community College Trustee Apportionment Commission be created to select regional community college trustee apportionment commissions and supervise and approve the determination of boundaries of community college trustee constituencies, in accordance with statutory and constitutional criteria. The State Community College Trustee Apportionment Commission shall consist of the State Director of Elections, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and one member selected by the State Community College Advisory Board from among its own membership.

The Committee further recommends that a Regional Community College Trustee Apportionment Commission, consisting of five registered electors of the community college region, be appointed by the State Community College Trustee Apportionment Commission for each of the community college regions. Each of these commissions shall determine the boundaries of the electoral constituencies for the regional board of trustees within their region, and shall submit their plan to the State Community College Trustee Apportionment Commission for approval.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 4

FINANCING THE OPERATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE REGIONAL DISTRICTS

The Committee recommends that the legislature, in addition to continuing its annual appropriations to community colleges, declare community college services properly a part of the basic governmental services provided throughout the state and therefore guarantee basic support for such services through amendment of the property tax limitation and allocation act (PA 62 '33) to require each county tax allocation board to allocate 1/2 mill out of the basic 15 mill tax on property to the community college region.

The Committee further recommends that a proposition automatically be placed before the people of each community college region at the general

election at which members of the boards of trustees of the newly created community college region are first elected to approve an additional 1.0 mill tax on all of the property of the community college region, such issue to be decided by a majority vote of those electors voting on the question throughout the community college region, and not separately by local units which may be contained in whole or part within the community college region. The adoption of this 1.0 mill tax of extra-voted operating millage shall have the effect of cancelling the levy of all other community college operating millages previously approved in any portion of the community college region as of the effective date of the new levy.

The Committee further recommends that the trustees of community college regions be granted authority to levy additional taxes on all of the taxable property of the community college region, not to exceed an additional 2.0 mills for operating purposes, by a majority vote of the electors voting on such issue throughout the community college region, and not separately by local units which may be contained in whole or part within the community college region.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

AUTHORIZATION OF BONDING AUTHORITY FOR NEW COMMUNITY COLLEGE REGIONS

The Committee recommends that the board of trustees of each community college region be granted the authority to issue bonds, with the review and approval of the Municipal Finance Commission, up to an amount equal to five per cent of the total State Equalization Valuation of the region for site acquisition and capital construction for a period of not less than 10 years nor more than 30 years. The Committee further recommends that as the bonds mature, or are retired, that the trustees shall have the authority to again issue bonds up to, but not exceeding, the five per cent limit. Legislative approval of this recommendation should not preclude required compliance with established procedures for state-supported and authorized capital outlay projects.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 6

ASSUMPTION OF THE ASSETS AND LIABILITIES OF EXISTING COMMUNITY COLLEGES BY THE NEWLY-CREATED COMMUNITY COLLEGE REGIONS

The Committee recommends that each newly-created community college region assume all of the assets and liabilities of existing community colleges located within their respective region, as of July 1, next following the election of trustees for the newly-created community college regions; and that the total of such assumed debt shall constitute an initial lien against the bonding authority of each new community college region.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

CLARIFICATION OF STATE RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT, FINANCING AND OPERATION OF THE STATE-WIDE SYSTEM OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The Committee recommends that the boards of trustees of community college regions remain under the same constitutional control and supervision of the State Board of Education as is the case with currently existing community college district boards. The Committee also recommends that the community college advisory board mandated by the Constitution and established by the legislature should continue to function in its present capacity, although we feel it might be advisable to expand its membership to at least one member per community college region.

The Committee further recommends that the Bureau of Higher Education of the State Department of Education be given increased statutory authority to review and approve program offerings of not only community college regions but also individual community colleges within regions, and make recommendations to the Bureau of the Budget and to the legislature concerning the funding of both capital outlay projects and annual operating budgets.

The Committee further recommends that a division for community college and post-secondary education planning and coordination be established within the Bureau of Higher Education to carry out the aforementioned responsibilities and functions, and that an adequate annual appropriation be made for this purpose.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 8

APPOINTMENT OF A CHANCELLOR IN EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE REGION OPERATING MORE THAN ONE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The Committee recommends that the trustees of each multi-college region appoint a regional chancellor. It is recommended that the chancellor be the full-time professional representative of the trustees, and chief administrative officer of the community college region.

In order to minimize the likelihood of either favoritism or excessive administrative supervision of a single community college, the Committee recommends that the office facilities of the chancellor not be located on, or immediately adjacent to, any community college campus within the region.

The community college president, in a single college region, in addition to his role as chief academic officer of his college, should automatically assume the functions of chancellor as they apply to his individual community college.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 9

IMPROVEMENT OF THE STATE-WIDE LIBRARY SYSTEM
IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN THROUGH THE
ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL LIBRARY CENTERS

The Committee recommends that the state-wide library system be improved through the establishment of regional library centers, and that one regional library center be established within each community college region. Support for the state-wide system of regional library centers should be provided through an annual state appropriation distributed pursuant to statutory formula and augmented within each region either through legislative amendment of the property tax limitation and allocation act (PA 62 '33) to guarantee the allocation of 1/4 mill out of the basic 15 mill tax on all property to the regional library system, or through the levy of such extra-voted millage as the electorate may approve by referendum within the library system region (which shall be coterminous with the community college region) by a majority vote of the electors voting on the question throughout the region.

The Committee further recommends the establishment of a nine-member regional library board for each region to be composed of:

-three (3) members appointed by the community college regional board of trustees

-three (3) members appointed by a group comprised of one representative from each local library system within the region

-three (3) members appointed by a group comprised of the representatives from each intermediate and each local school board within the region.

The Committee recommends that regional library centers maintain a region-wide master catalog of library resources, and perform such coordinating functions as centralized purchasing, processing and cataloging services for local public libraries, school district libraries and community college libraries within their region.

The Committee further recommends that universal state-wide library privileges be granted to all local library patrons, all school district pupils and staff, all community college students and staff, and all state university students and staff, to allow and encourage maximum utilization of the resources of all tax-supported libraries within the State of Michigan.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 10

DESIGNATION OF PRIME RESPONSIBILITY FOR VOCATIONAL
EDUCATION, TECHNICAL AND OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING
PROGRAMS WITHIN EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE REGION

The Committee recommends that the board of trustees of each community college region be designated as the primary planning and coordinating

agency for all state or federally funded vocational education and occupational training programs within its respective region, to eliminate not only duplication but also critical gaps in vocational-technical-occupational programs.

The Committee also recommends that a vocational-technical-occupational advisory committee be established within each region by the board of trustees. The membership of such advisory committees should be drawn from those vocational, technical, and occupational fields likely to employ the graduates of such programs within each region. Regional advisory committees should strive to insure that vocational education programs are relevant, in order to maximize the employment of students successfully completing such programs by local industries, commercial establishments and service agencies.

The Committee recommends that vocational-technical-occupational programs offered by community colleges require the approval of the Bureau of Higher Education of the State Department of Education as well as the approval of the Bureau of Vocational Education. Nothing in this recommendation is intended to preclude or eliminate the necessity of obtaining approval for program offerings and capital outlay projects from appropriate state agencies.

The Committee further recommends that the board of trustees of each community college region be empowered and encouraged to contract with intermediate and local school districts or other agencies to provide vocational education service for both high school and post-high school students within their region. Part-time vocational-technical-occupational students should be counted on a proportional basis. High school students receiving vocational education services at a community college on a "shared time" basis should be recognized as fractional equated students for both community college and K-12 purposes. This procedure will insure fairness and equity in financing the state's vocational education programs.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 11

AUTHORIZATION FOR JOINT FINANCING AND COOPERATIVE OPERATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE HEALTH EDUCATION INSTRUCTION AND PUBLIC RECREATION FACILITIES

The Committee recommends that the legislature grant specific statutory authorization for joint funding and cooperative agreements for the establishment and operation of health education instruction and public recreation facilities between community college regional boards of trustees and appropriate local, county, regional, state or federal agencies. It is further suggested that such joint ventures may qualify for participation in federal land and water monies, as well as possible state assistance for both capital outlay and operational purposes.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 12

ESTABLISHMENT OF REMOTE SATELLITE
COMMUNITY INSTRUCTIONAL CENTERS
WITHIN EACH COMMUNITY COLLEGE REGION

The Committee recommends that community college regional boards of trustees consider the establishment of satellite instructional centers, as appropriate, in near proximity to masses of population who are remote from--and therefore not adequately served by--community college campuses within the community college region. It is recommended that such centers be housed initially in existing buildings within such communities and that a resident director be in-charge of each remote center.

Development of satellite instructional centers should bring people into closer contact with the community college, and contribute to making community college services more accessible and relevant to the locales wherein such centers are established.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 13

PROVISION OF STUDENT COUNSELING, TESTING
AND CAREER GUIDANCE PROGRAMS WITHIN EACH
COMMUNITY COLLEGE REGION

The Committee recommends that the board of trustees of each community college region establish student counseling, testing and career guidance programs to maximize productive utilization of educational opportunities by assisting students in focusing their efforts toward realistic career and educational goals.

The Committee further recommends that the board of trustees of each community college region consider the possibility of including student assistantships within such counseling programs, in order to increase the receptivity of students for counseling services.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 14

CREATION OF A STATE-WIDE EDUCATIONAL
TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

The Committee recommends the creation of a state-wide educational non-commercial television network within the State of Michigan.

The Committee further recommends the establishment of an educational television and telecommunications commission to oversee the establishment and operation of a public educational, non-commercial telecommunications network. The state-wide system of community college regions should serve

as the organizational base for such a network, and it should facilitate the expansion of educational opportunities, provide greater visability for cultural enrichment programs and aid in the dissemination of information of interest to all Michigan residents.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 15

IMPLEMENTATION OF UNIFORM COURSE NUMBERING IN THE STATE-WIDE SYSTEM OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The Committee recommends that a uniform course numbering system for courses with comparable requirements and credit be devised by an ad hoc committee including representatives from each of the new community college regions. Such a system would facilitate the transfer *without penalty* of credits earned by students at various community colleges within the state. Uniform course numbering should also facilitate transfer from community colleges to four-year state colleges and universities for continuation of work toward baccalaureate degrees.

The Committee further recommends that the Bureau of Higher Education of the State Department of Education be charged with the responsibility for coordinating this effort, and that work of this program be initiated at the earliest practical date.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 16

ALIGNMENT OF THE BOUNDARIES OF NEW INTERMEDIATE SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH APPROVED BOUNDARIES OF NEWLY CREATED COMMUNITY COLLEGE REGIONS

The Committee recommends that the legislature direct the boundary commission charged with the responsibility of determining the boundaries of the new intermediate (regional) school districts to establish such districts so that they are either coterminous with the legislatively approved boundaries of the newly created community college regions or, if a greater number of intermediate (regional) school districts are considered necessary, to establish such additional intermediate (regional) school districts by partitioning the newly created community college regions into two or more intermediate (regional) school districts. The Committee strongly recommends that in no case should an intermediate (regional) school district be established by the boundary commission so as to include territory from two or more community college regions, as approved and established by the legislature.

The Committee feels that adherence to this recommendation will help reduce confusion, and will contribute to the re-organization of the state's total educational efforts on a logical regional basis.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 17

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STATUTORY STANDARD TUITION POLICY WITHIN THE STATE-WIDE SYSTEM OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The Committee recommends that the statutory standard tuition policy established by the legislature for the state-wide system of community colleges be implemented as of July 1, 1971. Although several members of the committee feel that community college services should be provided to Michigan resident students without charge, and that community colleges should be supported solely by state appropriations and such local millage revenue as they may be able to obtain, we are mindful of the present limitations on these two sources of funds--and, therefore, recommend that the standard in-district tuition of $10 per semester credit hour, or its equivalent, be implemented as of July 1, 1971.

The Committee also recommends that in accordance with the established pattern of charging out-of-state students three times as much as Michigan resident students at our four-year institutions of higher education, the standard community college tuition of $30 per semester credit hour, or its equivalent, for out-of-state students should be implemented as of July 1, 1971.

The Committee recognizes that some Michigan resident students will continue to attend our community colleges as out-of-district students even after total districting is accomplished. Therefore, the committee further recommends that a standard tuition be established for Michigan resident students who attend community college in a district other than the one in which they reside.

As there are many reasons which might justify a continuation of out-of-district attendance--such as lack of availability of a specific course of study within the student's district of residence--the Committee further recommends that a system of *charging-back* the out-of-district differential to the student's district of residence be established to assist students who attend community college in another district for good cause and with the consent of their district of residence.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 18

INTERIM PLAN FOR EXTENDING COMMUNITY COLLEGE SERVICES TO ALL MICHIGAN CITIZENS IRRESPECTIVE OF PLACE OF RESIDENCE

The Committee recommends that the legislature, in line with its declaration that community college services are properly a part of the basic governmental services which should be provided throughout the state, therefore provide an interim system of financing the immediate extension of community college services to all Michigan residents not residing in an operating community college district.

The Committee recommends specifically the immediate creation of a state community college non-operating district student assistance fund to be administered by the State Board of Education. This fund to be used to pay the "out-of-district tuition differential" for Michigan resident students residing outside of an operating community college district and attending community college as an out-of-district student. The fund also to be used to provide grants and loans to such students to assist them in defraying excessive transportation and other extraordinary expenses necessitated by their attendance at a community college in an operating community college district distant from their normal place of residency.

The Committee further recommends that the legislature either provide the funds required to meet the obligations of the state community college non-operating district student assistance fund through an annual appropriation to the State Board of Education, and such supplemental appropriations as may be necessary, or by timely amendment of the property tax limitation and allocation act (PA 62 '33) to require each county tax allocation board to allocate to the state community college non-operating district student assistance fund 1/2 mill out of the basic 15 mill tax on all property within their county not included within an operating community college district.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 0 8 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION